

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 are pending. By this Response, claims 1, 4-6 and 9-11 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

#### **Claim Objections**

The Office Action objects to claim 4 under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) as being an improper multiple dependent claim. In Response, applicants have amended claims 4 and 5 to address the objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

#### **Embodiments of the Invention**

Embodiments of the present invention are directed to a monitoring system for monitoring locations. A system includes monitoring modules for recording images of the monitor locations and a remote monitoring station, from which an operator may monitor the locations. The monitoring modules are arranged to analyze the images obtained and identify any individuals or objects that are cause for alarm. If an alarm is identified, the module transmits data in a stylized manner to the monitoring station. The data when presented in a stylized manner allows easier analysis of the monitored location to allow a user to identify individuals and changes in the monitored location. Further, in embodiments of the present invention, analysis of the monitored images and decision making for identifying any individual or object that causes an alarm, is performed within the monitoring modules. Thus, identification is performed at the monitoring

module and the stylized area is created and transmitted to the monitoring station. This allows for transmission of the data at a lower bandwidth while at the same time providing data that is easily interpreted by an operator at the monitoring station.

### Prior Art Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Seeley, et al. (US 6,097,429). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Seeley discloses a side control unit that processes video images obtained from a plurality of cameras located throughout a defined area and relays the presence of an intrusion to a central station. The site control unit includes an image acquisition module which receives video images from the cameras. An image processor of the side control unit processes the images to detect an intruder. A video recorder of the side control unit records images of the actual intrusion, produces snap shots of the detection intrusion, and transmits the snapshots to the central station for viewing by an operator. The snapshots may first be transmitted as “thumbnails” and upon selection by the operator, the full size snapshot may be transmitted. See column 13, lines 16-43.

The Office Action alleges that the cameras of Seeley correspond to applicants’ claimed monitoring modules and that the central station corresponds to applicants’ claimed remote monitoring station. Further, the Office Action alleges that data representing an area that is transmitting in a stylized way is taught by the use of “thumbnails” in Seeley which are transmitted to the central station. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cameras of Seeley are not arranged to analyze the images as in the present invention. Instead, the analysis is performed by the site control unit,

which is connected to a plurality of cameras. The cameras themselves receive the information and provide this information to the site control unit. Thus, Seeley does not teach monitoring modules as recited in independent claims 1, 6 and 9, which may each both monitor a location and analyze images of the monitored location. In embodiments of the present invention, each monitoring module has a light sensitive sensor for recording the images and is also arranged to carry out computer based analysis of the images. Seeley teaches away from this feature as it requires all images acquired by the cameras to be transmitted to the site control unit.

Thus, Seeley fails to teach, *inter alia*, extracting in each of the monitoring modules an area in the recorded image that differs from a reference image, extracting in each of the monitoring modules an object from the area, classifying in each of the monitoring modules the object based on characteristics, such as a characteristic of the type: size, shape and/or movement history, associated with the object, if the object is a human alarm object, as recited in claim 1.

Further Seeley fails to teach, *inter alia*, the monitoring modules being arranged to carry out computer-based analysis of the images, which comprises extracting areas from the images that differ from a reference image, extracting an object from the area, classifying the object based on characteristics, such as a characteristic of the type: size, shape and/or movement history, associated with the object, as recited in claims 6 and 9.

Further, applicants respectfully submit that the use of “thumbnails” in Seeley does not constitute representation of the images in a stylized way as claimed by applicants. The “thumbnails” in Seeley are merely scaled down versions of the original image. The thumbnails represent a scaled down version of the entire image. According to Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (<http://www.m-w.com>), “stylized” means “to represent or design according to a style

or stylized pattern rather than according to nature or tradition.” Scaling down an image to create “thumbnails” does not represent the image in a stylistic pattern. The same image is represented just at a smaller scale and thus the presentation is of an image according to its natural state, although on a reduced scale. In contrast, in embodiments of the invention, an area of an image is extracted and then an object of the area is extracted. The area is transmitted in a stylized manner which allows for easier interpretation of the data. Applicants note that only a specific area of the image is transmitted in a stylized way. In Seeley, the “thumbnails” are not representations of extracted areas in an image, since they treat the entire image in the same way.

Therefore, Seeley does not teach, *inter alia*, if the object is classified as a human alarm object, transmitting data representing the area in a stylized way to the monitoring station, as recited in independent claims 1, 6 and 9.

Regarding claim 2, the Office Action refers to U.S. Patent No. 5,956,424 in addressing this claim, applicants note the Examiner has not formally rejected dependent claim 2 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,424 and therefore this leads applicants to conclude that claim 2 is allowable. Applicants view the recitation of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,424 as a citation of relevant patents as would normally be presented at the end of the Office Action.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that Seeley fails to teach each and every feature of independent claims 1, 6 and 9 as discussed above. Further, dependent claims 2-5, 78-8 and 10-11 are distinguishable for the above reasons as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-11 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 10, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By



Michael R. Cammarata

Registration No.: 39,491

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant